DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 684 HE 010 977

AUTHOR Chronister, Jay L.; And Others
TITLE Independent College and University Participation in Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education. An Occasional Research Report.
INSTITUTION National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C. National Inst. of Independent Colleges and Universities.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 69p.; Table in Appendix B may not reproduce well due to small print
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Research, National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, Suite 503, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College Planning; Government Role; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Interagency Cooperation; National Surveys; Needs Assessment; *Postsecondary Education; *Private Colleges; Professional Associations; Questionnaires; *State Boards of Education; State Government; *Statewide Planning; Statistical Analysis; Statistical Studies; Surveys; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

The operational relationship between the independent sector and state planning agencies, and the issues and accomplishments of the independent sector in statewide planning for postsecondary education are examined in this study. Covered are private institution participation in statewide planning through spring 1978 and the perceptions of state agencies and independent sector associations regarding the level, success, and potential problems of this participation. Issues of concern to both groups are delineated, and mechanisms for successful participation are described. The survey instrument is appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165684

Independent College and University Participation in Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education

Jay L. Chronister

Elizabeth Flanagan
Michael M. Myers
Research Assistants

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Occasional Research Report
from the State-National Information Network

Office of Research
National Institute of Independent
Colleges and Universities
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 503
Washington, D.C. 20036

HE 010 977

© 1978, by

National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities

for the State-National Information Network for Independent Higher Education

Additional copies may be obtained for $3.00 from the

Office of Research
NIICU
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 503
Washington, D.C. 20036

INDEPENDENT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION IN STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

by

Jay L. Chronister
Associate Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
School of Education, University of Virginia

Elizabeth Flanagan
Michael M. Myers
Research Assistants

November 1978

National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 503
Washington, D.C. 20036

TA3LE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword		i
Preface		ii
Introduction		1
Section		
I	Current Status of State Planning for Postsecondary Education	5
II	Nature of Independent Sector Involvement in Planning	9
III	Perceived Successes in Planning	19
IV	Major Issues and Agenda Items Which Must Be Addressed	23
V	Conclusions	27
Appendix		
A	An Aggregate Analysis of Selected Items for Thirty-One States for Which Responses Were Received from Both the State Independent College Association and State Planning Agency	32
B	A State-by-State Summary of Independent Sector Participation in Selected Aspects of Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education as Reported by Responding Agencies	44
C	Survey Instrument	50
D	Agencies Responding to Study Survey	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Respondents to the Study	3
2	Current Status of State Planning for Postsecondary Education as Identified by Responding Public Agencies and Independent College Associations	7
3	Is There Written Provision at the State Level for Involvement of the Independent Sector in State Postsecondary Education?	9
4	Mechanisms Through Which Independent Colleges in Twenty-Five States Participate in Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education	10
5	Median Levels of Public and Independent Institution Participation in Selected Postsecondary Education Planning Activities as Reported by Public Agencies and Independent College Agencies	11
5A	Types and Degree of Independent College Participation as Reported By State Agencies and Independent College Associations	12
5B	Types and Degree of Public College Participation in Selected Statewide Planning Activities As Reported by the State Agencies and the Independent College Associations	13
6	Types of Data Independent Colleges Provide to the State Agency Responsible for Postsecondary Educational Planning	15
7	Is the Excessive Duplication of Programs Between Independent and Public Institutions a Major Planning Concern?	16
8	In Evaluating Needs for New Degree Programs in Public Institutions, Is a Review Made of Available Similar Programs in Independent Institutions?	17
9	Do Independent Institutions Need Approval From A State Agency?	17
10	Does Your State Encourage the Sharing of Resources Between Public and Independent Institutions?	18

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table		Page
11	Perceived Success of the State Planning Agency in Effectively Involving the Independent Sector in State Planning and Policy Development	19
12	Percentage Distribution of Success Ratings of Involvement of the Independent Sector in Planning in Relation to the Existence of Written Provisions in States for Such Involvement	20
13	Perceived Success of the State Planning Agency in Planning for the Effective Utilization of Independent Sector Resources in the Best Interests of the State	21
14	State Planning Issues Involving Independent Higher Education Which must be Addressed as Identified by Public Agency and Independent Association Respondents	24

FOREWORD

This report describes the results of a study of the participation of the independent sector of higher education in statewide planning for postsecondary education. It is an update and expansion of an earlier study by the same author "Statewide Planning and Private Higher Education." The twofold purpose of this study is to provide information on the operational relationships between the independent sector and state planning agencies and the issues and accomplishments of the independent sector in statewide planning for postsecondary education.

The first study reported on statewide planning and independent higher education through 1975 from the perspective of state agencies having planning responsibilities in postsecondary education. This report covers independent sector participation in statewide planning through spring 1978 and the perceptions of both state agencies and independent sector associations regarding the level, success and potential problems of this participation.

The results of Dr. Jay L. Chronister's first study demonstrated the need for a State-National Information Network for Independent Higher Education, sponsored by the National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities and the State Associations' Executive Council. It gives us special pleasure to sponsor the update of this study by Dr. Chronister as a publication of this Network which is partially funded by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Lilly Endowment, Inc.

This report clearly delineates the common issues of concern to both sectors for successful statewide planning, particularly in the forthcoming era of demographic decline among the traditional age cohort. It also describes mechanisms that have resulted in successful participation in state-planning activities in both sectors.

We would like to give special thanks to the state agencies and the independent state associations who participated in the survey, to Dr. Chronister's research assistants -- Elizabeth Flanagan and Michael M. Myers -- who assisted in the tabulation and analysis of the data, and finally to Dr. Chronister for his outstanding research and reporting on a topic of increasing importance to all of higher education.

Virginia Ann Fadil
James Olliver
November 1978

PREFACE

This report presents the results of a study of the participation of the independent sector of higher education in statewide planning for postsecondary education. The purpose is to provide a body of knowledge to those affected by, and those involved in, the decision making in this evolving public policy arena.

The study could not have been completed without the cooperation of the staff members of state agencies and independent college associations who graciously gave of their time in completing the survey instrument which was utilized to gather the data for this investigation. The support and encouragement of James Olliver and Virginia Fadil of the State-National Information Network, National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, was critical to completion of the project.

The time consuming task of collating, tabulating and interpreting the survey responses fell heavily upon the shoulders of Betsy Flanagan and Michael Myers who are doctoral students in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Virginia and who served as research assistants on the project. A special thank you to Becky Zellers who assisted in the mailings, typed and retyped drafts of the report, and generally arranged the author's calendar to keep the project on schedule. However, after acknowledging the contributions of all who were involved, the full responsibility for the conclusions of the report rests with the author.

Jay L. Chronister

INTRODUCTION

During the decade of the 1970's, the relationships between the states and the independent sector of higher education have become a major public policy issue. In terms of broad policy studies and recommendations at the national level, leadership has been provided by the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities,[1] and its sucessor, the National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education,[2] the Education Commission of the States,[3] and recently by the Brookings Institution.[4] Since 1971 there have been several definitive studies of the constitutional issues involved in state aid for independent higher education, as well as analyses of the types of aid being provided to independent institutions and/or their students.

The issues involved in state planning for postsecondary education and the role of the independent sector in the planning process have gained increased attention in the past few years. Several recent reports have set forth cases for the involvement of the independent sector in the planning process, and a few studies have analyzed aspects of the existing planning relationship. Wilson,[5] in a recent study utilizing a telephone survey, investigated the extent and forms of independent college participation in long range planning, new program approval, existing program review, and satisfaction with these activities.

---

[1] A National Policy for Private Higher Education: The Report of a Task Force of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974.

[2] The States and Private Higher Education: Problems and Policies in a New Era. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

[3] Final Report and Recommendations: Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education. Denver, Col.: Education Commission of the States, Report No. 100, 1977.

[4] Breneman, David W. and Finn, Chester E., Jr. (eds.), Public Policy and Private Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

[5] Wilson, Richard F., Private College Long Range Planning and Program Review Relationships With Statewide Higher Education Agencies Throughout the States, Technical Report. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, December 30, 1977.

Wilson's study utilized executive officers of statewide higher education agencies and independent college associations as the survey population.

The Final Report and Recommendations of the ECS Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education included three specific recommendations regarding statewide planning and independent higher education.

> "Statewide planning should be concerned with issues involving the independent sector, and postsecondary education including the independent sector should be accorded full participation in state planning and coordination."
>
> "The state's planning approach to independent institutions will favor one of two alternatives: a student-centered approach, which emphasizes a fair market, or an institution-centered approach, which emphasizes the development of an efficient network of institutional opportunities. Most states employ an intermediate approach, with some mixture of these two elements. The choice of emphasis should be based upon the state's goal for postsecondary education, its assessment of the actual and potential contribution made by the independent sector to those goals, its legal structure and its history and traditions of education development."
>
> "State policy makers should be sensitive to the protection and enhancement of institutional integrity in public and independent institutions alike, especially in those areas where it is most important to the vitality and effectiveness of the educational process. Institutional leaders should recognize the concessions to institutional autonomy that are made necessary under conditions of state support."[6]

The study reported in the following pages is an update and expansion of an earlier study entitled "Statewide Planning and Private Higher Education."[7] The current study was designed to provide information on 1) operational relationships between state postsecondary educational planning agencies and independent sector institutions, and 2) the issues and achievements vis-a-vis independent college involvement in the planning process.

---

[6] Final Report and Recommendations, op. cit., p. ix.

[7] Chronister, Jay L., "Statewide Planning and Private Higher Education." Special Report, Number PA. Denver, Col.: Education Commission of the States, 1976.

The specific purposes of the study are multifaceted:

1. To identify the extent and nature of independent college participation in statewide postsecondary education planning and to compare this participation with that of public institutions.

2. To identify the types of operational relationships which exist between the independent institutions and the statewide postsecondary education planning agency in terms of the types of data provided by the independent colleges.

3. To assess the relative success of the state planning agency in a) involving the independent sector in planning and policy development, and, b) in planning for effective utilization of independent resources in the best interest of the state, as perceived by the state agency and the independent sector.

4. To identify the major agenda items regarding independent higher education that must be addressed in the next several years in state planning for postsecondary education.

Information for the study was acquired through use of a questionnaire mailed to the survey population which included statewide postsecondary education planning agencies (1202 commissions), statewide public institution governing/coordinating agencies, and statewide independent college associations. The purpose of involving both the public agencies and the state independent associations was to gain the perceptions and perspectives of both sectors on the issues under study.

The study was conducted during the Spring and Summer of 1978 and the distribution of agencies responding to the survey is set forth in Table 1.

TABLE 1

RESPONDENTS TO THE STUDY

Type of Agency	N	%
Public		
A. Statewide Coordinating	7	8.0
B. Statewide Governing	11	12.5
C. Postsecondary Education Commission (PEC)	17	19.3
D. Coordinating Board/PEC	16	18.2
E. Governing Board/PEC	3	3.4
Independent		
A. State Association	34	38.6
Total Agencies Responding	88	100.0

The public coordinating, governing, and 1202 agencies in all fifty states plus the District of Columbia were included in the original survey population. A response was received from all but two states, and among the fifty-four public agency responses in Table 1 are six states from which surveys were returned from two public agencies in each state. In the analyses which follow, only the public agency with comprehensive higher education or postsecondary education planning responsibilities from multiple response states will be included, unless otherwise indicated. In addition, the response from Wyoming has been deleted since there are no independent institutions in that state.

The thirty-four independent association responses represent 85 percent of the 40 states with an established state association of independent colleges.

The findings of the study are set forth primarily in descriptive terms. The intent of the analysis is twofold: first, to describe the current status of the independent college sectors involvement in state planning for postsecondary education as defined by both the independent sector and the state agency responsible for postsecondary education; and second, to analyze and describe any perceived differences in responses from the two sectors.

It was assumed at the outset of the study that in describing the current developments in state planning for postsecondary education, with a goal of assessing the role and function of the independent sector in the process, that the expectations of what that role should be would vary considerably among the states and between sectors of higher education within the states. In addition to a presentation of aggregate data as supplied by all public and all independent agencies and associations, specific attention is given to responses from states where responses from both the state agency and the independent college association have been received. Significant contrasts in response to the same questions will be highlighted as central or potential areas of policy concern.

SECTION I

CURRENT STATUS OF STATE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

For this section of the study, the survey population was requested to provide information as to the existence of a state master plan for postsecondary education and whether the role and function of the independent sector colleges were set forth in the plan. The responses to the series of questions related to this area are set forth in Table 2.

Among the forty-seven states for which a usable response was received from the public agency, twenty-seven (57.4%) of the states have a published master plan for postsecondary education according to the responding agency. Within twenty-five of those plans the agencies reported that the role and function of the independent sector are set forth. Of the thirty-four responses from state independent college associations, twenty reported the existence of a state master plan and fifteen reported that the role and function of the independent sector are set forth in the plan.

In attempt to ascertain the congruence of responses to these questions from both the public agency and independent agency within the same state, an analysis of data from thirty-one states for which responses were received from agencies in both sectors was undertaken.* Among these thirty-one states, twenty of the public agencies and nineteen of the independent associations cited the existence of a master plan. Nineteen (95%) of the public agencies and fourteen (73.7%) of the independent agencies citing the existence of a master plan stated that the role and function of the independent sector were set forth in the plan. Although there is only an aggregate difference of one in responses between the sectors in the statement of the existence of a master plan, actual differences in sector response were evident in five states. In other words, public agencies in three states cited the existence of a master plan while the independent agencies in those states cited no plan. Conversely, independent agencies in two other states cited the existence of a plan while the state agency in each of those states indicated no plan existed. This lack of congruence carried over into responses to the question of the statement of the role and function of the independent sector in the state plan where differences were noted in seven states.

The discrepancies evident in the responses from the thirty-one states indicate a difference in the expectations of respondents which will become evident in other analyses which follow. Several

---

*Appendix A provides an analysis of these state responses on a number of variables.

comments made by respondents are illustrative of why the discrepancies occur. In terms of the discrepancy on the existence of a master plan, several respondents indicated that the existing document was not in actuality a plan but an inventory of educational resources and in one instance was specifically cited as representing only the public sector and not the independent sector. This difference became more pronounced in analyzing the degree to which the role and function of the independent sector were set forth within the plan. The common area of discrepancy revolved around the point that citing the independent institutions and/or their programs is not in fact describing their role and function. From a policy perspective this is an issue which must be resolved if master planning is to be effective.

In an attempt to ascertain the current status of the planning process, the survey population was asked if the update of an existing plan or the development of a new master plan was a current project in the state. As indicated in Table 2, Part C, thirty of the public and twenty of the independent agencies responded in the affirmative. Utilizing a state-by-state analysis, ten of the public agencies which had earlier indicated that no plan existed in their state identified the development of a plan as a current project.

As shown in Table 2 twenty-nine of the thirty public agencies, and eighteen of the twenty independent agencies, which stated a plan was being updated or developed, also state that the role and function of the independent sector will be set forth in the plan.

TABLE 2

CURRENT STATUS OF STATE PLANNING FOR
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AS IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDING
PUBLIC AGENCIES AND INDEPENDENT COLLEGE ASSOCIATIONS

A. Does your state have a published master plan for post-secondary education?

	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
Public Agency	27	57.4	20	42.6	47
Independent College Association	20	58.8	14	41.2	34

B. Are the role and perceived function of the independent college sector set forth in the plan?

Public Agency	25	92.6
Independent College Association	15	75.0

C. Is a plan now being updated or developed?

Public Agency	30	68.2	14	31.8	44
Independent College Association	20	58.8	14	41.2	34

D. Will the role and function of the independent sector be specified in the plan under development?

Public Agency	29	96.6
Independent College Association	18	90.0

In response to the question of whether a master plan was being developed or updated, of the thirty-one states for which matched responses could be analyzed, twenty-one public agencies indicated an update or development of a plan is in progress and all twenty-one indicate that the plan will include a specification of the role and function of the independent sector. Among the thirty-one independent association respondents, nineteen acknowledge the development or update of a plan at the state level with seventeen stating that the role and function of the independent sector will be set forth in the plan.

An analysis of responses to questions in this section of the study indicates the developmental status of comprehensive statewide planning

for postsecondary education in many states. While approximately 58 percent of the responding states indicated the existence of a master plan for postsecondary education, there was a discrepancy in the responses from the public agencies and independent agencies as to whether the role and function of the independent sector were set forth in the plan. This discrepancy carried over into the responses as to whether the development or update of a master plan was a current project in the state, and if so, whether the independent sector's role and function would be set forth in that plan.

The reasons for these discrepancies will become evident in the sections which follow.

SECTION II

NATURE OF INDEPENDENT SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN PLANNING

One of the major purposes of this study was to determine the nature of the independent sector involvement in the planning process for postsecondary education, to identify the strategies or structures through which the involvement was achieved and to determine the amount of agreement between the public and independent agencies on these items. Thirty-two of forty-five responding public agencies and twenty-four of thirty-four responding independent agencies stated that there was written provision at the state level for involvement of the independent sector in state postsecondary education planning (Table 3). These written provisions most often took the form of statutes or executive orders.

TABLE 3

IS THERE WRITTEN PROVISION AT THE STATE LEVEL FOR INVOLVEMENT OF THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR IN STATE POSTSECONDARY PLANNING?

	Yes		No		
Responding Agency	N	%	N	%	Total Responses
Public	32	71.1	13	28.9	45
Independent College Association	24	70.6	10	29.4	34

The mechanisms through which the independent institutions are involved in the planning process are set forth in Table 4. Included in Appendix B of this report are tables which show the state-by-state listing of involvement strategies as reported by individual responding agencies.

An analysis of responses from the forty-seven responding states indicated that the most common approach was through independent sector voting representation on the state agency responsible for planning (1202 agency), or where an agency responsible for public higher education was designated as the 1202 commission, through membership on the committee with advisory responsibility to the designated agency. The direct contact from the planning agency to individual institutions as a means of involvement was the most frequently cited strategy by public agencies and was usually utilized in combination with another strategy. Responses to the survey indicated that the mechanisms for

participation varied considerably among the states and that in most states multiple avenues for participation are provided.

TABLE 4

MECHANISMS THROUGH WHICH INDEPENDENT COLLEGES IN TWENTY-FIVE STATES PARTICIPATE IN STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Mechanisms	Reported by Independent Associations N=34	Reported by State Agencies N=47
Through voting membership on the state agency responsible for postsecondary education planning	13	16
Through a committee of independent college presidents acting in an advisory role to the planning agency	10	13
Through a council of independent colleges acting in an advisory role to the planning agency	12	12
Direct contact from the planning agency to individual institutions	11	23
Through membership on a representative advisory committee to the planning agency	8	15
Participation on task forces, subcommittees, ad hoc committees	7	8

The types of planning activities and level of participation in which the independent colleges are involved through the previously cited mechanisms are set forth in Table 5. In order to assess the level of participation and in order to provide a point of comparison, both the public agency and the independent association in each state were requested to identify, for both sectors, the planning activities in which each was involved, utilizing a level of participation scale of 0 to 3. Table 5 sets forth the rating scale and the median rating derived for each activity by sector.

The following observations can be made from the data: 1) with few exceptions, both the public and independent agencies reported public institution participation at a higher level of involvement in the selected planning activities than the independent institutions; and 2) in general, the independent agencies reported both public and independent institution participation at a lower level than did the public agencies.

TABLE 5

MEDIAN LEVELS OF PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT INSTITUTION PARTICIPATION IN SELECTED POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY PUBLIC AGENCIES AND INDEPENDENT COLLEGE AGENCIES

Types of Planning Activities	Public Sector Participation as reported by		Independent Sector Participation as reported by	
	Public Agency	Independent Agency	Public Agency	Independent Agency
A. Identification of short-term educational needs of the state	2.31	1.50	1.65	0.96
B. Identification of long-term educational needs of the state	2.44	2.10	2.04	1.35
C. Identification of changing economic conditions with implications for postsecondary education	1.97	1.56	1.39	0.85
D. Appraisal of plans, needs and utilization of resources of public institutions	2.50	2.00	1.00	0.61
E. Appraisal of plans, needs and utilization of resources of independent institutions	0.42	0.32	1.90	1.50
F. Development of statewide enrollment projections	2.41	1.56	1.50	1.14
G. Development of new academic offerings in public institutions	2.67	2.50	0.78	0.50
H. Development of new academic offerings in independent institutions	0.23	0.17	0.38	0.37
I. Distribution of state subsidies to students/institutions in the public sector	2.25	2.00	0.44	0.19
J. Distribution of state subsidies to students/institutions in the independent sector	0.42	0.41	2.11	2.00

0 = No involvement
1 = Passive involvement -- plans and materials sent to institutions for review and comment, but no meetings are held with institutional representatives
2 = Active involvement -- by meeting with all affected parties to review materials with an opportunity to make modifications
3 = Full involvement -- by meetings/discussions prior to development of materials with an opportunity for all sectors to set assumptions, frame questions, and make modifications

TABLE 5A

TYPES AND DEGREE OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGE PARTICIPATION AS
REPORTED BY STATE AGENCIES AND INDEPENDENT COLLEGE ASSOCIATIONS

Types of Planning Activities	Level of Participation as Reported by State Agencies				Level of Participation as Reported by State Independent College Associations			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
A. Identification of short-term educational needs of the state	11	13	12	11	9	10	3	7
B. Identification of long-term educational needs of the state	11	9	11	16	6	9	6	8
C. Identification of changing economic conditions and the implications of the changes for postsecondary education	16	12	12	8	10	11	6	2
D. Appraisal of the plans, needs, and utilization of resources of public institutions	22	5	12	7	13	12	3	1
E. Appraisal of the plans, needs, and utilization of resources of independent institutions	18	3	11	15	10	5	7	8
F. Development of statewide enrollment projections	15	10	11	11	8	9	8	5
G. Development of new academic program offerings in public institutions	22	9	11	5	14	5	4	5
H. Development of new academic program offerings in independent institutions	28	1	3	12	16	3	4	6
I. Distribution of state subsidies/allocations to students and/or institutions in the public sector	26	6	7	7	20	6	3	0
J. Distribution of state subsidies/allocations to students and/or institutions in the independent sector	18	0	9	19	7	2	11	10
K. Other	11	0	2	1	6	0	0	1

0 = No involvement
1 = Passive involvement -- plans and materials sent to institutions for review and comment, but no meetings are held with institutional representatives
2 = Active involvement -- by meeting with all affected parties to review materials with an opportunity to make modifications
3 = Full involvement -- by meetings/discussions prior to development of materials with an opportunity for all sectors to set assumptions, frame questions, and make modifications

TABLE 5B

TYPES AND DEGREE OF PUBLIC COLLEGE PARTICIPATION IN SELECTED STATEWIDE PLANNING ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY THE STATE AGENCIES AND THE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE ASSOCIATIONS

Types of Planning Activities	Level of Participation as Reported by State Agencies				Level of Participation as Reported by State Independent College Associations			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
A. Identification of short-term educational needs of the state	8	4	15	20	8	5	4	9
B. Identification of long-term educational needs of the state	8	2	16	21	7	4	5	10
C. Identification of changing economic conditions and the implications of the changes for postsecondary education	9	9	15	15	9	3	8	5
D. Appraisal of the plans, needs, and utilization of resources of public institutions	11	2	11	23	9	2	6	9
E. Appraisal of the plans, needs, and utilization of resources of independent institutions	26	6	9	6	17	5	3	2
F. Development of statewide enrollment projections	9	4	12	22	9	4	8	6
G. Development of new academic program offerings in public institutions	11	1	7	28	8	2	3	13
H. Development of new academic program offerings in independent institutions	33	6	5	2	17	2	2	3
I. Distribution of state subsidies/allocations to students and/or institutions in the public sector	13	0	13	20	9	2	5	11
J. Distribution of state subsidies/allocations to students and/or institutions in the independent sector	26	6	7	6	14	3	5	3
K. Other	11	0	1	1	8	0	0	1

0 = No involvement
1 = Passive involvement -- plans and materials sent to institutions for review and comment, but no meetings are held with institutional representatives
2 = Active involvement -- by meeting with all affected parties to review materials with an opportunity to make modifications
3 = Full involvement -- by meetings/discussions prior to development of materials with an opportunity for all sectors to set assumptions, frame questions, and make modifications

In analyzing state-by-state responses to this particular area of questions on the survey instrument, those states which appear to have a well organized state independent association and a history of public-independent working relationship, had the highest levels of agreement on the responses to the questions. These same states also had the independent sector most highly involved in the identification of short-term and long-term educational needs of the state, changing economic conditions, and the development of statewide enrollment projections.

From an institutional perspective, those activities which are conceived of as being the province of local institutional decision-making received a much lower rating of involvement for the independent sector than for the public sector. The case in point is the difference in ratings for involvement of institutions from both sectors in the development of new academic offerings in each sector. The independent governance structure of the independent sector of higher education precludes (with a few exceptions where public agencies have statutory authority to review and approve new programs or degree level offerings) the statewide review and approval procedures for this sector as opposed to the review and approval procedures to which new academic programs are subject in the public sector.

Based upon analysis of the actual responses from the agencies, a larger proportion of independent associations cited no involvement or passive involvement in the planning activities for both public and independent institutions than did the public agencies. Several factors are instructive in analyzing this difference. First, the structure of the majority of the responding state agencies is such that there is a greater degree of interaction between the agency and the public institutions in terms of a coordinating or governing function, and therefore, much more continuous communication exists between the agency and the institutions. Second, the involvement of the independent sector is, with a few exceptions, relatively new and evolving. In addition, the development of state associations of independent institutions with adequate administrative support personnel is a developing situation in many states, and the interaction of the independent sector with state agencies is not yet highly coordinated or unified. A third factor which must be recognized is the effect of statutory and constitutional constraints on state involvement in matters construed to be the province of the independent institution and vice versa.

Underlying an effective planning process at the state level is the acquisition of appropriate and timely data upon which to base decision-making. If the independent sector is to be effectively involved in the planning process and adequately represented in state plans, it is necessary that data regarding this sector's capabilities, operations and resources be made available to the planning agency. Table 6 sets forth the types of data that independent colleges provide to the state planning agencies.

TABLE 6

TYPES OF DATA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES PROVIDE TO THE
STATE AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Types of Data	As Reported By State Agencies						As Reported By Independent College Associations					
	Data Reported Routinely and Annually			Data Reported Upon Special Request			Data Reported Routinely and Annually			Data Reported Upon Special Request		
	HEGIS	Other	Both	HEGIS	Other	Both	HEGIS	Other	Both	HEGIS	Other	Both
A. Current Enrollment	25	2	10	3	3	0	14	7	7	1	3	0
B. Geographic Origin of Students	10	11	2	3	9	0	9	11	2	0	6	1
C. Ability Descriptors of Entering Students (ACT/SAT, H.S. Rank, etc.)	0	6	0	0	12	0	3	6	0	0	9	0
D. Information on Student Applications/ Admissions	1	6	0	1	12	0	2	6	0	0	10	0
E. Enrollment Projections	3	5	0	1	13	0	1	10	0	0	13	0
F. Student Aid Data	3	15	0	0	13	0	2	12	2	0	7	0
G. Institutional Finances	20	3	3	1	5	0	13	4	2	1	4	0
H. Information on Existing Degree Programs	11	6	6	1	14	0	12	9	1	0	5	0
I. Information on New Degree Programs	2	10	2	0	16	0	4	10	1	1	9	0
J. Inventory of, and Conditions of, Physical Plant	15	1	3	3	10	0	6	4	1	1	7	0
K. Other	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	3	0	0	1	0

As shown in Table 6 the submission of standard HEGIS reports is the most commonly reported data base. In a number of states, a standard annual reporting system more responsive to state needs has also been developed. The magnitude of the data base which the independent colleges provide to state planning agencies appears to be directly related to several factors: 1) the stage of development of postsecondary education planning in the state, and 2) the existence of, types of, and amount of state financial support provided to the independent sector and its students.

The question of state agency review and approval of new programs and the offering of new degree levels at both public and independent institutions are two of the major policy issues involved in comprehensive state planning for postsecondary education. The issue of excessive duplication of programs between independent and public institutions is a major state planning concern according to nearly 65 percent of the responding public and independent agencies (Table 7).

TABLE 7

IS THE EXCESSIVE DUPLICATION OF PROGRAMS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS A MAJOR PLANNING CONCERN?

	Yes		No		
Responding Agency	N	%	N	%	Total Responses
Public	28	63.6	16	36.4	44
Independent	20	64.5	11	35.5	31

As several respondents indicated, the determination of what is excessive duplication is a major planning concern.

In dealing with this expressed state concern for the excessive duplication of programs, nearly 82 percent of the public agencies and 75 percent of the independent association respondents to the question cited in Table 8 indicated that in evaluating the needs for new degree programs proposed by public institutions, some review is made of comparable programs at independent colleges in the state. The nature of this review process varies considerably among the states ranging from a checking of the programs listed in a central program inventory by the appropriate public agency to a more sophisticated procedure of submission of the proposed programs for review, comment, and reaction to institutions which offer similar programs.

TABLE 8

IN EVALUATING NEEDS FOR NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, IS A REVIEW MADE OF AVAILABLE SIMILAR PROGRAMS IN INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS?

Responding Agency	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %	Total Responses
Public	36	81.8	8	18.2	44
Independent	24	75.0	8	25.0	32

In the context of state control of the offering of new programs and/or new degree levels by independent institutions, it was reported by eight public agencies and eight independent associations that in order to offer a new program, state agency approval was required (Table 9). Hidden within that aggregate of eight affirmative responses is the fact that in only five states did both the public and independent agencies respond with yes. The remaining affirmative responses reflect differences between the replies of state and independent agencies with the exception of one state where only the public agency was a respondent.

TABLE 9

DO INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS NEED APPROVAL FROM A STATE AGENCY?

	State Agency Response		Independent Agency Response	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
A. To offer new academic degree programs at a degree level in which programs are already offered?	8	38	8	26
B. To offer a new degree level?	14	32	12	22

As shown in Table 9 there are more states which control the offering of new degree levels by independent institutions. Among the fourteen public and twelve independent agency affirmative responses to this question, there was congruence in the response from both agencies in nine states. In addition, there were single responses from two states and actual discrepancies in response between the public and independent agency respondents in six states.

The amount of discrepancy in responses from agencies within a single state should be a policy concern since it reflects either a lack of understanding of statutory authority or lack of communication between agencies.

A final area of inquiry regarding programming at the state level dealt with the sharing of resources between public and independent institutions. As shown in Table 10, thirty (69.8%) of the public agencies which responded to this question, and twenty-one (61.8%) of the responding independent agencies indicated that their states encourage such sharing of resources through specialized programs. From among the thirty public agencies which responded in the affirmative to this question, twenty-one cited some formal mechanism for encouraging the sharing, and thirteen of the independent agencies cited a formal mechanism. The most often cited formal mechanisms for sharing resources were through contracts for services between public and independent institutions and through consortium arrangements.

TABLE 10

DOES YOUR STATE ENCOURAGE THE SHARING
OF RESOURCES BETWEEN PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS?

	Yes		No		
Responding Agency	N	%	N	%	Total Responses
Public	30	69.8	13	30.2	43
Independent	21	61.8	13	38.2	34

SECTION III

PERCEIVED SUCCESSES IN PLANNING

One of the purposes of this study was to assess, from the perspective of both the state agencies and the independent college associations, the relative success of the state planning agency in involving the independent sector institutions in planning and policy development. The agency responses to this area of inquiry are shown in Table 11. It can be seen from the table that the public agencies rate the effective involvement of the independent institutions as successful to a greater degree than do the independent college associations. Whereas 86.4 percent of the state agencies reported involvement of the independent sector as successful or marginally successful, only 68.7 percent of the independent associations rated the involvement this high.

TABLE 11

PERCEIVED SUCCESS OF THE STATE PLANNING AGENCY IN EFFECTIVELY INVOLVING THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR IN STATE PLANNING AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

	State Agency Response		Independent College Association Response	
	N	%	N	%
1. Successful	22	50.0	9	28.1
2. Marginally Successful	16	36.4	13	40.6
3. Unsuccessful	4	9.1	8	25.0
4. Not a Concern	2	4.5	2	6.3
N =	44	100.0	32	100.0

When responses to this item, regardless of agency type, were related to whether or not the state had written provision for involvement of the independent sector in postsecondary planning, a relationship became evident between the existence of written provision and perceived success. Forty-seven percent of the responding agencies (public and independent) from states which had written provisions for involvement of the independent sector rated the involvement as successful as opposed to only 14.8 percent of the agencies from states which lack such provision. The distribution of responses in this analysis are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESS RATINGS OF INVOLVEMENT OF THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR IN PLANNING IN RELATION TO THE EXISTENCE OF WRITTEN PROVISIONS IN STATES FOR SUCH INVOLVEMENT

	Agencies from States with Written Provisions	Agencies from States with No Written Provisions
Successful	47.3%	14.8%
Marginally Successful	40.0	44.4
Unsuccessful	12.7	22.2
Not a Concern	0.0	18.5
	100.0%	99.9%

An analysis of the comments provided by respondents concerning why they felt the involvement was successful, marginally successful, or unsuccessful is instructive in assessing reasons for success, or the lack of success. In the states where both the public and independent agencies indicated that the involvement was considered successful, there appeared to be a clearly stated mandate for effective comprehensive planning involving all sectors which would be affected by the planning, a well structured mechanism for involvement of the independent and public sectors in the process, full partnership of all sectors in the process, effective and multiple channels of communication, adequate financial support, and an openness and willingness to express concerns and interests in an environment of mutual respect.

The comment of two respondents from one state are especially appropriate in looking at the reasons why some states are successful in their attempts to involve the independent sector in the planning process. According to the independent association representative: "Independent institutions have a full 'seat at the table' on every issue that involves them directly or indirectly. Much care is given to making consultation real." The public agency representatives comments supported this perception as follows: "Representatives of the independent sector participate as a full partner with public representatives in all levels and phases of the planning process." Both agencies' spokesmen acknowledged that there were major issues and problems to be addressed and hard decisions were yet to be made, but that the structure is in place to deal with the issues in an effective fashion.

Those states in which the involvement of the independent sector has been unsuccessful were described as lacking a clear and supported mandate for comprehensive planning, lacking in adequate funding and a structure to encourage planning, a lack of openness on the part of both the public and independent sectors in expressing interests and concerns even when common to both sectors, and minimal channels of communication. A lack of "trust" was cited in several instances as was a divisiveness

over the question of aid to the independent sector. It is also important to note that in several instances, both independent and public agency representatives noted that if planning was not seen as a continued process and of importance at the campus level, it could not be viewed as successful. A corollary negative factor cited several times by independent representatives was the problem of being consulted on issues but not being part of the actual decision making.

A related area of inquiry dealt with how successful the various agencies felt the state's planning agency has been in planning for the effective utilization of the independent sector resources in the best interests of the state. As Table 13 shows, neither the public or independent agencies rated the state effort in this area as successful as that achieved in involving the independent sector in planning. Here again there is the tendency of the public agencies to rate the effort as more successful than do the independent associations.

TABLE 13

PERCEIVED SUCCESS OF THE STATE PLANNING AGENCY IN PLANNING FOR THE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF INDEPENDENT SECTOR RESOURCES IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STATE

	State Agency Response		Independent College Association Response	
	N	%	N	%
1. Successful	10	27.0	5	15.6
2. Marginally Successful	18	48.6	14	43.8
3. Unsuccessful	5	13.5	9	28.1
4. Not a Concern	4	10.8	4	12.5
N =	37	99.9	32	100.0

Respondent comments did not shed much specific light on factors which differentiate between the levels of success in effectively utilizing independent sector resources. The states which made reference to achieving some level of success were those which have provisions for contracts for services involving independent institutions, consortia arrangements between public and independent institutions, and in a more general context the use of student aid programs which facilitate student attendance at independent institutions. A major problem cited by representatives of both the public and independent agencies is to determine "effective utilization" in other such general terms as enrollment at independent institutions.

A number of respondents stated that although planning was in the early stages of development, the development of an inventory of resources available in their state was one of the objectives of the planning process. An observation made on a number of the responses was that although the independent sector and the state planning agency had made efforts to integrate the independent college resources in planning, legislative antipathy has hindered meaningful efforts to implement utilization of the resources.

SECTION IV

MAJOR ISSUES AND AGENDA ITEMS WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED

When independent and state agencies were asked what issues they perceived must be addressed in the context of state planning for post-secondary education involving the independent sector, two major contextual areas were identified. Comprehensive fiscal policy topics received primary attention, with questions raised on institutional and student aid, the fiscal impact of predicted enrollment decline, more effective resource utilization, and accountability on all levels. Secondary concerns tended to focus on the importance of role definition of independent and public agencies, along with the potential impact of cooperative planning.

The two areas were tied together by the issue of competition versus cooperation which both sectors felt must be resolved before realistic solutions can be sought for financial problems or planning concerns.

The major issue related to future fiscal policy was whether public aid to the independent sector was equitable and how future enrollment trends might affect the aid programs currently in existence. The greatest concern found on the part of the public agencies dealt with the need to derive more benefits from the independent institutions in exchange for their receipt of public monies. As might be expected, the independent agencies favored continuance of existing programs with potential increases in funding but expressed their concern over possible loss of autonomy in governance as increased accountability occurs. Both types of agencies stressed the need for accountability of public funds being used at institutions in both sectors.

Closely paralleling the issues raised over institutional aid, were those concerns expressed over the future of the various student aid programs benefiting students at independent institutions. Independent agencies designated this as an issue more often than did public agencies (Independent - 17: Public - 14) with their major focus on tuition grants. The widening tuition gap was viewed as problematic by both sectors, with several presenting the "access or choice" question. State agencies stressed an equitable distribution of funds, since they seemed to feel that independent agencies were getting their "share" at the present time.

The area receiving the fourth largest response was related to the enrollment question. Financial implications resulting from anticipated enrollment declines was also a concern of both sectors (Public - 13: Independent - 6). The uncertainty of the future seemed to pose a threat and several agencies questioned whether the decline would be

TABLE 14

STATE PLANNING ISSUES INVOLVING INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED AS IDENTIFIED BY PUBLIC AGENCY AND INDEPENDENT ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1. Finances - Public Aid to Independent Higher Education	35-Total	23-Public 12-Independent
2. Aid to Students Attending Independent Institutions	31-Total	14-Public 17-Independent
3. Cooperative Arrangements Between Public and Independent Institutions (competition, duplication problems)	32-Total	19-Public 13-Independent
4. Enrollment	19-Total	13-Public 6-Independent
5. Involvement of the Independent Sector in Planning	17-Total	8-Public 9-Independent
6. Resource Utilization	10-Total	4-Public 6-Independent
7. Accountability	9-Total	7-Public 2-Independent
8. Quality of Education	5-Total	3-Public 2-Independent
9. Subsidization of Off-Campus Programs	5-Total	3-Public 2-Independent
10. Role of State Postsecondary Education Commission	5-Total	3-Public 2-Independent
11. Impact of Federal/State Regulations on Institutional Operations	3-Total	2-Public 1-Independent

uniform, or could be made so, for all institutions. How decisions regarding the elimination of programs, staff, and institutions would be made dominated the narrative in this section. Both sectors appeared to favor a pre-determined plan of action to be implemented on a statewide basis.

Directly related to enrollment concerns were the issues raised by both public and independent agencies on how institutions can continue to offer a quality educational program when limited by finances brought on by declining enrollments. Both public and independent agencies mentioned the future of marginal institutions as an example.

Independent agencies, more than the public, (Independent - 6: Public - 4) raised the question of how to better utilize physical plants and other available resources rather than continue capital outlays at public institutions. The use of contracts for services and resources had appeal as a means of reducing capital investments, as did the strategy of sharing resources between public and independent institutions where the sharing could be viewed as a "trade-off."

In view of the concerns expressed above and their inherent ties to fiscal policy, it is not surprising that secondary concerns registered related to short- and long-range planning and better boundaries defined for all agencies.

The major issue in this area was raised equally by public and independent sectors. Both called for more involvement of the independent sector in statewide planning efforts (Independent - 9: Public - 8). In addition to increased involvement of the independent sector in plan development, it was also suggested that laypersons be encouraged to participate. With these ideas implemented, it was implied that many of the problems described in the first section could be remediated.

A second concern was often raised concerning the role the Post-Secondary Education Commission would play in the future. Would they hold approval power over institutions and new degree programs? What about control over state colleges? Confusion over the purpose and functions of the PSEC seemed obvious from the narrative. Several independent agencies suggested that a need exists to delineate goals and objectives for both public and independent institutions in areas of enrollment, programs and long-range commitments. On the issue of governance, some concern was expressed about the potential impact of federal and state regulations on both sectors and their relationship.

The major issues of fiscal policy and planning between public and independent sectors appears to point to the future necessity of "co-operative arrangements" between the two. (This concern was registered by 19 public and 13 independent agencies.) Competition between the two sectors was assumed to be a "given" and that any arrangements made must build upon this. Several independents commented on the necessity

of preserving the dual system of education, while another warned that this competition could prove to be a detriment to their continuance. Both sectors in several states expressed concern over off-campus program offerings and to whom the "market" would be given. While competition was not generally viewed from a negative perspective, potential divisiveness over funding and duplication of programs and services was viewed with concern. Several agencies mentioned the advantages of contractual arrangements as a possible solution to duplication problems. The concept of cooperation was not only mentioned directly in 32 cases but was implied in the other responses related to finances, aid, resource utilization, and enrollment. Cooperation was implied to be the base upon which future development in postsecondary education could be facilitated and directly affect financial and comprehensive planning efforts.

In summarizing this section it is safe to say that respondents to this survey have identified planning issues that are current as well as future problems. In most instances the concerns are not just the province of one sector but the province of higher education in general. Financial support, potential and real enrollment declines, effective planning, utilization of resources, cooperation versus competition, accountability for use of public funds (and independent funds also), quality of programs, etc. are issues facing all of higher education. As a number of respondents indicated, both the public and independent sector institutions must address the issues cited earlier on a cooperative basis because divisiveness will only attenuate the situation.

SECTION V

CONCLUSIONS

This study was designed to provide information on (1) the operational relationships between state postsecondary educational planning agencies and the independent sector institutions in the fifty states and the District of Columbia, and (2) the issues and achievements vis-a-vis independent college involvement in the planning process.

The findings of the study indicate that nearly every state has one or more mechanisms for involving the independent colleges and universities in state planning for postsecondary education. The public planning agencies and the state independent college associations that participated in the study provided information which shows that activities included in state planning for postsecondary education, and mechanisms for involvement of the independent sector, vary significantly among the states. In order for the planning process to be effective in terms of involving the independent sector, it is quite evident from the results of this study that a clear mandate for planning be established, that participants from all sectors be viewed as full partners in the process, that clear channels of communication be established to enhance the exchange of information and concerns, that planning be accepted as an institutional commitment as well as a state mandate, and that effective planning can only take place in an environment of "good faith" and mutual respect.

A significant finding of this study is the amount of variance in responses from public agencies and independent college associations in the same states on a large number of the items studied. These variances were evident in terms of the agreement on the mechanisms for involvement, activities in which the independent sector participates, the level of the participation, and the success measures assessed. The public agencies consistently rated the independent sector involvement at a higher level than did the independent associations. A portion of this variance can be attributed to expectations that both types of agencies have as to what constitutes involvement in the planning function. Findings suggest that where the independent sector's participation has been mandated and formalized and where the independent sector participation is at the "decision table" rather than "reactive" in nature on matters that affect them, the higher will be the level of agreement between the agencies and the higher the rating of success by both sectors in the effective involvement of the independent sector in planning.

The fact that institutions in the public sector are under state control to a degree not applicable to the independent sector in most

states makes effective planning and plan implementation a problem according to a number of respondents. When planning actions are interpreted in terms of individual institutional prerogatives a concern was expressed as to what the impact would be on internal institutional governance for independent colleges. In order to effectively implement a comprehensive state plan to the mutual benefit of all constituencies involved, the degree to which independent colleges must be bound by the decisions or recommendations of the planning agency was cited as a sensitive issue by respondents from both sectors.

The issue of the impact of planning at the institutional level was most prevalent in terms of academic program review and approval. Whereas in most states there is a mechanism for review and approval of new programs or degrees for public institutions there are very few states in which a public agency has such authority over independent institutions. Nearly 82 percent of the public agency respondents in this area of the study indicated that in evaluating needs for new programs in public institutions, a review was made of similar programs in independent institutions. This review was part of the approval process to the extent that in a number of states new programs were denied to public institutions when the review showed the existence of such programs in other public and/or independent institutions was adequate to meet a defined state need. Several respondents, representing both sectors, indicated there is a need to more effectively utilize the programmatic resources which are available in the independent sector as states plan for the anticipated decline in enrollment in the years ahead. Although a number of states have provided for contracts for services between sectors and other mechanisms for the sharing of resources, the number of examples of effective implementation of such capabilities indicate optimum use of such arrangements has yet to be achieved.

The major issues that respondents identified as statewide planning issues which must be addressed in the next several years dealt primarily with the questions of state aid to the independent sector; questions of competition, duplication, and cooperation between the two sectors; the impact of projected enrollment declines on the preceding and higher education in general; and the appropriate role of the independent sector in planning. Although identified as issues of planning related to independent higher education they are representative of issues facing all of higher education and must be dealt with in that context. Findings of this study indicate that in a number of states the operational relationships which exist between the state and the independent sector are not conducive to a planned resolution of the issues. Divisiveness over aid to the independent sector in times of financial stringency, concerns with planning agency authority and institutional prerogatives in decision making and uncertain political situations in several states are identified factors which are precluding positive action in addressing comprehensive planning issues in more than a few states.

The policy implications of the findings of this study are multidimensional in nature. A number of mechanisms or strategies for involving the independent sector in the planning process were identified, but of even more importance were the quality dimensions of the participation in those states where the participation was identified as successful. In comprehensive planning, the issues that face policymakers are relatively common across all sectors. The need to define the role and function of institutions to meet public needs is not delimited by sector boundaries. If a state desires to achieve efficiency and effectiveness in meeting postsecondary education needs of its constituencies, all institutions should be viewed as potential resources. This study has shown that not all states have taken that view towards the independent sector in terms of planning.

The relatively high level of success that agencies from both sectors expressed in terms of independent sector involvement in the planning process must be tempered by the lower level of success that both sectors attributed to planning for the effective utilization of independent sector resources in the best interest of the state. As respondents from both sectors indicated, if the products of planning are to be beneficial to both the state and the institution (public and independent), all resources should be viewed for potential contribution to meeting state needs. Such consideration requires a commitment at the institutional level to participate in, and abide by, the results of planning decisions on appropriately negotiated decision areas.

APPENDIX A

AN AGGREGATE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED ITEMS FOR
THIRTY-ONE STATES FOR WHICH RESPONSES WERE RECEIVED FROM BOTH THE
STATE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE ASSOCIATION AND STATE PLANNING AGENCY

Thirty-one states provided responses from agencies or associations representing both public and independent sectors of higher education. Public sector respondents, for this analysis, included 1202 commissions and coordinating or governing boards - or combinations of 1202 commissions and coordinating or governing boards. Independent sector responses were received from associations representing the independent colleges and universities within the state. This analysis examines the responses of two groups - the public agencies, and independent college associations - on identical questions pertaining to independent college and university participation in statewide planning for postsecondary education.

Crosstabulation, a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more groups of variables, was chosen as the mode of presentation. The technique allows efficient and effective tabular presentation and statistical analysis of data. "Chi-square," as a test of statistical significance, and "phi," (or "Cramer's V") as a measure of association, were calculated for each table.

In the following crosstabulations, the understood "null" hypothesis is "there are no differences in the responses of the 1202 commissions-public agencies and the independent associations." This is because: (1) only states with responses from both groups (pairs of responses) are included in the sample; (2) both groups received identical survey questionnaires; and (3) since only paired sets of responses were included in the sample, each pair should "ideally" have similar responses because they are from the same state interpreting identical state policies with regard to independent sector involvement in statewide planning for postsecondary education. Therefore, discrepancies in responding between the two groups may indicate differing perceptions or interpretations, misinformation, poor communication, etc. Such discrepancies imply that problems exist hindering an optimal public and independent postsecondary climate. By documenting the existence of problems of this nature, efforts can be undertaken to eliminate them and thus channel valuable resources into the ultimate task: to offer the highest quality postsecondary educational system possible within the inevitable environmental constraints.

The chi-square test of statistical significance compares the observed frequencies of responses (what is) to the frequencies that should be observed if the null hypothesis was true (what should be). If the discrepancy between what is (observed) and what should be (null hypothesis) exceeds a predetermined level (usually .05), the difference is labeled "statistically significant." Statistical significance, however, describes a rather extreme discrepancy - in the following instances in which the null hypothesis is a legitimate expectation, differences may exist that are not "statistically significant" but may be described as "practically significant." Thus differences that are not statistically significant may be noted because they deviate somewhat from the expectation of complete agreement.

In the following crosstabulations, the 2 X 2 tables (having one degree of freedom) utilize a "corrected" chi square test as a correction for continuity. The chi square distribution is continuous, while the calculation of the chi-square statistic involves discrete data; therefore, a correction in the calculating formula is necessary.

The chi-square test, by itself, helps only to decide whether or not the two samples are significantly different or not. It does not indicate how strongly they are related. The "phi" statistic, for 2 X 2 tables, or the "Cramer's V" statistic, for larger tables, are measures of association. The strength of the relationship is indicated by values on a continuum from 0 to 1. Phi - or Cramer's V - takes on the value of 0 when no relationship exists, and the value of 1 when the variables are perfectly related.

1. The responses to "Does your state have a published master plan for postsecondary education?" are shown in Table A.

TABLE A

PUBLISHED MASTER PLAN?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	20	11	31
	64.5%	34.5%	50%
Independent	19	12	31
	61%	39%	50%

Corrected chi square = 0 significance = 1.0

phi = .033

As a whole, the differences in responding by the two groups are very insignificant. The existence (or lack of) of a master plan is apparently a well-known fact in the interaction between the public agencies and the independent associations, as indicated by the consensus.

If the response to the above was yes, the repondent was asked "Is the role and perceived function of the independent sector of higher education in meeting postsecondary education needs of the state set forth in the plan?" The results are shown in Table B.

TABLE B

IS THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR ROLE SPECIFIED IN THE MASTER PLAN?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	19	2	21
	47.5%	5%	52.5%
Independent	14	5	19
	35%	12.5%	47.5%

Corrected chi square = .959 significance = .33

phi = .221

The aggregated responses indicate some disagreement on the specified independent role; the differences are not statistically significant, but reveal that the 1202 commissions - public agencies - perceive that the role of the independent sector is set forth in the master plan more frequently (47.5%) than that role is perceived to be by the independent associations (35%).

The responses to "Is the development, or updating of a plan a current project in your state?" are shown in Table C.

TABLE C

PLAN NOW BEING UPDATED OR DEVELOPED?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	21	8	29
	35%	13%	48%
Independent	19	12	31
	32%	20%	52%

Corrected chi square = .409 significance = .52

phi = .118

The discrepancy in responding between public agencies and independent associations is not statistically significant on the issue of developing or updating a master plan; nonetheless, there is not total concurrence on this issue. More independent associations (20% to 13%) reported that a master plan is not being developed or updated.

If the response to the question immediately above was yes, the respondent was asked "Will the role and perceived function of the

independent sector of higher education in meeting postsecondary education needs of the state be set forth in the plan?" The results are shown in Table D.

TABLE D

INDEPENDENT ROLE SPECIFIED?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	21	0	21
	55%		55%
Independent	17	0	17
	45%		45%

No statistics - two empty cells

While the sample size varied, there was complete agreement between both responding groups that the independent role will be specified in the developed or updated master plan.

The responses to "Are written provisions made in your state for independent college and university participation in the planning process?" are shown in Table E.

TABLE E

PROVISIONS FOR INDEPENDENT PARTICIPATION?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	22	8	30
	36%	13%	49%
Independent	24	7	31
	39%	12%	51%

Corrected chi square = .005 significance = .94

phi = .047

There was nearly total concensus between the public agencies and the independent associations on the existence of "written provisions" for independent college and university participation in the planning process.

The respondents were asked "Do the independent institutions in your state need approval from a state agency to offer a new academic

program at a degree level in which programs are already offered?" The responses are shown in Table F.

TABLE F

PROGRAM APPROVAL NEEDED?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	7	23	30
	11%	38%	49%
Independent	8	23	31
	13%	38%	51%

Corrected chi square = .005 significance = .94

phi = .029

The aggregated responses indicate little disagreement on the issue of state agency approval for new academic programs in independent institutions.

The respondents were asked "Do the independent institutions in your state need approval from a state agency to offer a new degree level?" The responses are shown in Table G.

TABLE G

DEGREE APPROVAL NEEDED?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	12	19	31
	19%	31%	50%
Independent	11	20	31
	18%	32%	50%

Corrected chi square = 0 significance = 1.0

phi = .033

On the issue of state agency approval for new degree levels for independent institutions, the accord between public agencies and independent associations is almost unanimous.

The agencies-associations were asked "Is the excessive duplication of programs between public and independent institutions a major planning

concern in your state?" Table H shows the responses.

TABLE H

CONCERN FOR EXCESSIVE DUPLICATION?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	20	9	29
	34%	15%	49%
Independent	20	10	30
	34%	17%	51%
Corrected chi square = .008		significance = .93	
phi = .025			

There was essentially complete concurrence between groups on the issue of state planning concern for excessive program duplication between public and independent institutions.

The agencies-associations were asked "In evaluating the needs for new degree programs in the public sector, is a review made of available similar programs in the independent sector?" Table I shows the responses.

TABLE I

INDEPENDENT PROGRAMS REVIEWED?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	26	4	30
	44%	7%	51%
Independent	22	7	31
	37%	12%	49%
Corrected chi square = .534		significance = .46	
phi = .139			

There are some discrepancies between groups on the issue of the review of existing degree programs in the independent sector in evaluating the needs for new degree programs in the public sector. While the differences are not statistically significant, more public agencies (44% to 37%) reported that independent programs are reviewed, while more independent associations (12% to 7%) reported that independent programs are not reviewed.

The responses to "Does your state encourage the sharing of resources between the public and independent institutions through specialized programs?" are exhibited in Table J.

TABLE J

PUBLIC-INDEPENDENT SHARING OF RESOURCES?

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	23	6	29
	38%	10%	48%
Independent	19	12	31
	32%	20%	52%

Corrected chi square = 1.548 significance = .21

phi = .197

On the issue of state encouragement for the sharing of resources between public and independent institutions through specialized programs, there are definite though not statistically significant differences in the responses of the two groups. The public agencies tend to report more "state encouragement" (38% to 32%), while the independent associations reported more negatively (20% to 10%) on the issue.

If the agencies-associations answered yes to the question immediately above, they were asked to "please specify mechanism(s)." The responses - "formal" to "informal" - are exhibited in Table K.

TABLE K

MECHANISM FOR SHARING

Agency	Yes	No	Total
Public	17	6	23
	41%	14%	55%
Independent	12	7	19
	28%	17%	45%

Corrected chi square = .172 significance = .68

phi = .116

There is some lack of agreement between the two groups on the "mechanism" for sharing resources between public and independent sectors. Formal mechanisms for sharing resources were specified more frequently by public agencies (41%) than by independent associations (28%).

The agencies surveyed were asked "How successful do you feel the state's planning agency has been in effectively involving the independent sector in state planning and policy development?" The response alternatives of "successful," "marginally successful," "unsuccessful," or "not a concern" are shown in Table L.

TABLE L

INDEPENDENT INVOLVEMENT IN PLANNING

Agency	Successful	Marginally Successful	Unsuccessful	Not a Concern	Total
Public	18	10	1	0	29
	62%	35%	3%		100%
Independent	9	12	6	2	29
	31%	41%	21%	7%	100%

Raw chi square = 8.753 significance = .03

Cramer's V = .388

The two groups were asked to evaluate the success of the state's planning agency in effectively involving the independent sector in state planning and policy development. There are distinct discrepancies in the aggregated responses - statistically significant differences. Most (62%) public agencies reported that the state's planning had successfully involved the independent sector in planning - only 3 percent indicated "unsuccessful" or "not a concern." The independent associations, however, reported only 31 percent were "successful," while 28 percent were "unsuccessful" or "not a concern." The public agencies tended to rate the level of success of involving the independent sector in the planning process at a much higher level than did the independent associations.

The agencies-associations surveyed were asked "How successful do you feel the state's planning agency has been in planning for the effective utilization of the independent sector resources in the best interest of the state?" The response alternatives of "successful," "marginally successful," "unsuccessful," or "not a concern" are shown in Table M.

TABLE M

INDEPENDENT RESOURCES UTILIZED EFFECTIVELY

Agency	Successful	Marginally Successful	Unsuccessful	Not a Concern	Total
Public	7	13	1	2	23
	30%	57%	4%	9%	100%
Independent	5	13	8	3	29
	17%	45%	28%	10%	100%

Raw chi square = 5.357 significance = .148

Cramer's V = .321

The two groups were asked to evaluate the success of the state's planning agency in planning for the effective utilization of the independent sector resources in the best interest of the state. The differences in responding are not statistically significant; there are, however, definite discrepancies in the aggregated responses. The public agencies reported 30 percent as "successful" - only 13 percent responded "unsuccessful" or "not a concern." The independent associations reported 17 percent as "successful," but 38 percent as "unsuccessful" or "not a concern."

CONCLUSIONS

The questions corresponding to Tables A through J involved interpretive responses; the agencies-associations were asked to "interpret" state policies relating to independent colleges and university participation in statewide planning for postsecondary education. The questions corresponding to Tables K and L required evaluative responses; the performance of state planning agencies was assessed.

The aggregated responses to each of the "interpretive" questions revealed no "statistically" significant differences in responding between public agencies and independent associations. However, there were distinct discrepancies in responding between the two groups on several questions. Table J, regarding "independent sharing of resources" (sig. = .21), shows clear differences on the important issue of resource sharing. Table B, relating to the specification of the independent role in the state master plan, indicates some disagreement (sig. = .33). The review of independent programs, in evaluating needs

for new programs in the public sector (Table I), generated some lack of consensus (sig. = .46). Disagreement on whether or not "the state master plan is now being updated or developed" was evidenced in Table C (sig. = .52). There was some discord as to whether "formal" or "informal" mechanisms for sharing resources (Table K) were being used (sig. = .68).

There were relatively few differences in responding between the public agencies and the independent associations on the following issues: published master plan (Table A), specification of the independent role in a master plan being updated or developed (Table D), provisions for independent participation (Table E), program approval needed (Table F), degree approval needed (Table G), and concern for excessive duplication (Table H).

The two "evaluative" questions elicited much greater discrepancies. The responses from the public agencies and independent associations rating the success of the state's planning agency in effectively involving the independent sector in state planning and policy development differed significantly statistically (sig. = .03). Also, in evaluating the effective utilization of independent sector resources in the best interest of the state, differences were evident (sig. = .148) but not statistically significant.

With respect to the issue of "independent sector involvement in planning" (Table L), the public agencies evaluated the state agencies "success" or "marginal success" at 97 percent; only three percent were rated "unsuccessful" or "not a concern." The independent associations' rating, respectively, were 72 percent and 28 percent.

On the issue of "independent resources utilized effectively" (Table M), the corresponding totals for the public agencies were 87 percent and 13 percent; for the independent associations, similarly, 62 percent and 38 percent.

APPENDIX B

A STATE-BY-STATE SUMMARY OF INDEPENDENT SECTOR PARTICIPATION IN SELECTED ASPECTS OF STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AS REPORTED BY RESPONDING PUBLIC AGENCIES

STRATEGIES FOR INVOLVING THE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE SECTOR IN COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANNING

A. Voting membership on state agency responsible for postsecondary education planning.

   1. This strategy usually combines lay membership with representative membership from the public and independent sectors.
   2. The most formal and direct form of participation in policy development.
   3. May involve individual institutional representatives plus a spokesman for the collective independent sector.

B. A committee of independent college presidents acting in an advisory role to the planning agency.

   1. Generally the board of the planning agency is lay member in structure.
   2. The committee of college presidents is a satellite body serving in an advisory capacity on appropriate or selected issues which impact upon the independent sector.
   3. A counterpart public sector committee may also serve in such a role, depending upon the state public higher education governance structure.

C. A council of independent colleges acting in an advisory capacity to the planning agency.

   1. This strategy differs slightly from B in that a formally structured council serves as the collective spokesman for the independent sector on matters affecting that sector.
   2. In some states a combination of the council spokesman and selected individuals from the individual colleges serve as the advisory body.
   3. The established independent college association also functions as the independent sector information collection agency and clearinghouse to facilitate communication and interaction.

D. Direct contact from the planning agency to each independent institution on an individual basis.

E. Other

   1. The use of ad hoc advisory committees including both public sector and independent sector representatives was commonly identified as a mechanism for acquiring independent sector participation in planning.
   2. The use of representative public-independent sector representation on ad hoc advisory committees was utilized in conjunction with items A-D in most instances.

KEY:

Mechanisms

A Voting membership in the planning agency
B Committee of independent college presidents acting in an advisory role to the planning agency
C Council of independent colleges in the state acting in an advisory capacity to the planning agency
D Direct contact from state agency to each institution
E Other

Types of Participation

F Identification of short-term educational needs of the state
G Identification of long-term educational needs of the state
H Identification of changing economic conditions
I Appraisal of plans for resource utilization in public/state institutions
J Appraisal of plans for resource utilization in independent/private institutions
K Development of statewide enrollment projections
L Development of new academic program offerings in the state/public sector
M Development of new academic program offerings in the independent/private sector
N Distribution of state subsidies to students and/or institutions in the state/public sector
O Distribution of state subsidies to students and/or institutions in the independent/private sector
P Other

Data Format

H = HEGIS
O = OTHER
X = UNDESIGNATED SOURCE

State-By-State Analysis of Independent Institution Participation in Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education as Reported by Public Agencies

State and Agency	Mechanisms for Participation	Types of Participation	Data Provided State Agency: Current Enrollment	Students' Geographic Origin	Ability Descriptors	Application/Admissions	Enrollment Projections	Student Aid Data	Institutional Finance	Existing Degree Programs	New Degree Programs	Physical Plant Inventory	Other	Attempt to Avoid Program Duplication	Encourage Sharing of Resources
Alabama - Commission on Higher Education[2]	ACDE	LMNO	H	O					H	H	H		□	Yes	Yes
Alaska - Commission on Postsecondary Education[3]	AE	All	H	H		H		O	O	O	O	H		Yes	No
Arizona - Commission on Postsecondary Education[1]	Not Applicable													No	No
Arkansas - Department of Higher Education[2]	BCDE	All	HO	O		O	O	O		O	O	O		Yes	Yes
California - Postsecondary Education Commission	ACE	All but MP	HO	O					H	HO		H	O	Yes	Yes
Colorado - Commission on Higher Education[2]	DE	JL	HO	H			O	O	H	H	O	O		No	No
Connecticut - Board of Higher Education[3]	AE		H							H	O		H	Yes	Yes
Delaware - Postsecondary Education Commission	DE	All but MOP	HO					O		O	O			No	Yes
District of C. - Commission on Postsecondary Education	A	FGIJM	H	H	O	O	O		H	H	O	H			
Florida - Postsecondary Education Commission	A	All but LNP	H				H	O	H	H		H		Yes	Yes
Georgia - Postsecondary Education Commission	A	FGK	H						H	H		H		Yes	Yes
Hawaii - Postsecondary Education Commission	D	FGIJ													Yes
Idaho - State Board of Education[3]	DE	JM												No	Yes
Illinois - Board of Higher Education[3]	BC	All but M&P	HO	H	O	O		O	H	O	O	H	O	Yes	Yes
Indiana - Commission for Higher Education[3]	CD	FGHKO	HO	O	O		O	O	H	O	O	H		Yes	Yes
Iowa - Higher Education Facilities Commission[2]	AC	All but NP	H				O	O	H	H	O	H		No	Yes
Kansas - Legislative Educational Planning Committee[3]	DE	FGJKNO	HO				O		H	O	O	HO		Yes	No
Kentucky - Council on Higher Education	E	FGIJKM	H	H	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		No	Yes
Louisiana - Board of Regents[3]	BD	GIJKO	H	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		No	Yes
Maine - Postsecondary Education Commission	A	FGHKNO	H	O	O	O	O	O	H	O	O	O		Yes	Yes
Maryland - State Board for Higher Education[3]	B	All but KP	H	H	O	O	O	O	O	H	O	H		Yes	Yes
Massachusetts - Postsecondary Education Commission	A	GO	H	H	O	O			H	H	O	O		Yes	Yes
Michigan - State Board of Education[3]	CDE	GKO	HO	H	O	O	O	O	H	O	O	H		No	No
Minnesota - Higher Education Coordinating Board[3]	DE	FGHLM	HO	O		O		O	H	O	O	H		Yes	Yes
Mississippi - Postsecondary Education Planning Board	No Response														
Missouri - Coordinating Board for Higher Education[3]	E	FGHIJKO	HO	O	O	O	O	□	H	O	O	H		No	Yes
Montana - Commission on Federal Higher Education Programs[3]	AD		O	O	O	O	O	O	H	O	O	H		No	No
Nebraska - Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education	AE	K	H	HO					H	O		H	O	No	No
Nevada - Higher Education Commission[3]	A		H							O	O			No	No
New Hampshire - Postsecondary Education Commission[3]	A	All	H	H						HO	HO	H		Yes	Yes
New Jersey - State Board of Higher Education[2]	ACDE	All	H	O	O	O	O		H	O	O	H		Yes	Yes
New Mexico - Board of Educational Finance[2]	BD	All but KMO	H					□		HO				Yes	Yes
New York - Board of Regents[3]	CDE	GIJKMO	H	HO		O	O		HO	HO	HO	HO		Yes	No
North Carolina - Board of Governors[4], Univ. of North Carolina	B	K	H	O	O	O	H	H	H	H				Yes	Yes
North Dakota - Postsecondary Education Commission	DE	No Response	X	X						X	X	X		Yes	
Ohio - Board of Regents[3]	BCD	FGIJMO	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		Yes	Yes
Oklahoma - State Regents for Higher Education[3]	BDE	GHJM	H	O	O		O	O	O			H		Yes	No
Oregon - Educational Coordinating Commission[3]	CDE	All	HO	HO			O	O	H	HO	O	O		Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania - State Department of Education[3]	BD	FGHIJKLM	H	O	O	HO	H	H	O	H	O	O		Yes	Yes
Rhode Island - Postsecondary Education Commission	ADE	FGL	H	H				O	H	H		H	H	Yes	Yes
South Carolina - Commission on Higher Education[3]	BCDE	FHJ	H	O	O	O	O	O	H	HO	O	H	H	Yes	Yes
South Dakota - Department of Education and Cultural Affairs Planning Commission[2]	BE	O												Yes	No
Tennessee - Higher Education Commission[3]	CE	JKNO	HO	O			O	O	H	□	O	H		No	Yes
Texas - Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System[2]	BC	FGNO	X	X						X	X	X		Yes	Yes
Utah - State Board of Regents[2]	DE	FGILM	HO		O	O				HO	O			Yes	Yes
Vermont - Higher Education Planning Commission	ADE	FGHKNOP	H	HO	O				H	HO	O	H	H	No	No
Virginia - State Council of Higher Education[3]	BDE	GKNO	H	O		O	O	O		O		O		Yes	Yes
Washington - Council for Postsecondary Education[3]	A	All but MN	H	H			H	O		H				Yes	Yes
West Virginia - Board of Regents[2]		No Response													
Wisconsin - Board of Regents[4]	D	JMO	No Response to these items												
Wyoming - Higher Education Council	No independent colleges in state														

[1]No comprehensive master planning
[2]Functions as Postsecondary Education Planning Commission when augmented
[3]Designated Postsecondary Education Commission
[4]No postsecondary education planning agency has been designated (1202)

APPENDIX C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
CURRY MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

April 4, 1978

Dear Colleague:

In recent years increased attention has been focused on the growing interaction between state agencies and independent colleges and universities. Several recent studies have addressed the question of structures and mechanisms for involving the private/independent sector of higher education in statewide planning for postsecondary education.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to gather information which will expand upon recent studies by facilitating an analysis of the operational relationships between the state planning agency and the independent sector institutions. A significant portion of the study involves determining the perceptions of state agencies concerned with comprehensive postsecondary education planning, statewide independent college associations, and statewide public institution governing/coordinating agencies as to the issues and achievements vis a vis independent college involvement in statewide planning.

Your cooperation in this endeavor is deeply appreciated. In order to meet deadlines established for providing the preliminary report it is necessary that we receive completed questionnaires no later than April 21, 1978.

Sincerely,

Jay L Chronister

Jay L. Chronister
Associate Professor of Education

JLC:bkz

405 EMMET STREET RUFFNER HALL UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CHARLOTTESVILLE 22903

Independent College and University Participation In
Statewide Planning For Postsecondary Education

State: _____

Title of Agency or Association Reporting: _____

_____

Name of Individual Completing Questionnaire: _____

Title _____

1. Does your state have a published master plan for postsecondary education?

   a. Yes _____ Date of Publication _____
   b. No _____
   c. If yes, is the role and perceived function of the independent sector of higher education in meeting postsecondary education needs of the state set forth in the plan?

      1) Yes _____
      2) No _____

2. Is the development, or updating of a plan a current project in your state?

   a. Yes _____ If yes, what is the expected publication date? _____
   b. No _____
   c. If yes, will the role and perceived function of the independent sector of higher education in meeting postsecondary education needs of the state be set forth in the plan?

      1) Yes _____
      2) No _____

3. Are written provisions made in your state for independent college and university participation in the planning process?

   a. Yes _____
   b. No _____

   Please attach a copy of the statutory provision or any policy statement relating to the involvement of the independent sector.

4. What is (are) the mechanism(s) through which independent institution participation is provided: (Check all that apply)

a. _____ Through actual voting membership on the board of the agency responsible for planning. Total number of members of the board _____. Public sector representatives _____. Independent sector representatives _____.

b. _____ Through a committee of independent college presidents acting in an advisory role to the planning agency.

c. _____ Through a council of independent colleges in the state acting in an advisory capacity to the planning agency.

d. _____ Through direct contact from the state agency to each independent institution individually.

e. _____ Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

5. In which of the following types of activities and to what extent do the public/state college and university sector (through their board or boards) and the independent/private sector (either as institutions or through an association) participate in the development of statewide plans and state policy? Rank all that apply using the following code:

0 = no involvement
1 = passive involvement - plans and materials sent to institutions for review and comment but no meetings with institutional representatives are held
2 = active involvement by meeting with all affected parties to review materials with an opportunity to make modifications
3 = full involvement by meetings/discussions prior to development of materials with an opportunity for all sectors to set assumptions, frame questions, and make modifications

	Public/State Sector	Independent/ Private Sector	
a.	_____	_____	The identification of short-term educational needs of the state and its citizens.
b.	_____	_____	The identification of long-term educational needs of the state and its citizens.
c.	_____	_____	The identification of changing economic conditions and the implications of these changes for statewide postsecondary education.
d.	_____	_____	The appraisal of the plans and needs and utilization of the resources of public/state institutions.

e.	_____	_____	The appraisal of the plans and needs and utilization of the resources of private institutions.
f.	_____	_____	The development of statewide enrollment projections.
g.	_____	_____	The development of new academic program offerings in the state/public sector.
h.	_____	_____	The development of new academic program offerings in the independent/private sector.
i.	_____	_____	The distribution of state subsidies/allocations to students and/or institutions in the state/public sector.
j.	_____	_____	The distribution of state subsidies/allocations to students and/or institutions in the independent/private sector.
k.	_____	_____	Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____

6. Which of the following types of data do the independent/private colleges provide the state agency responsible for postsecondary educational planning? Check those which apply, using an "H" to indicate HEGIS data, "O" to indicate all other.

Routinely and annually	Upon special request		
_____	_____	a.	Current enrollment
_____	_____	b.	Geographic origin of students
_____	_____	c.	Ability descriptors of entering students (ACT/SAT, rank in high school)
_____	_____	d.	Information on student applications/admissions
_____	_____	e.	Enrollment projections
_____	_____	f.	Student aid data (specify) _____
			_____
_____	_____	g.	Institutional finances
_____	_____	h.	Information on existing degree programs
_____	_____	i.	Information on new degree programs
_____	_____	j.	Inventory of, and condition of, physical plant
_____	_____	k.	Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____

7. Do the independent institutions in your state need approval from a state agency

   a. To offer a new academic program at a degree level in which programs are already offered? Example: The addition of new programs at the baccalaureate degree level if programs are already offered at that level. Yes _____ No _____ Name of agency _____

      Comments: _____

      _____

   b. To offer a new degree level? Example: A college has been offering baccalaureate degrees and desires to offer master's degree programs. Yes _____ No _____
      Name of agency _____

      Comments: _____

      _____

8. Is the excessive duplication of programs between public/state institutions and independent/private institutions a major planning concern in your state? Yes _____ No _____

   a. If yes, what actions have you taken to deal with the problem?

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

   b. In evaluating needs for new degree programs in the public/state sector is a review made of available similar programs in the independent/private sector? Yes _____ No _____

   c. If your answer to (b) was yes, what strategy or mechanism is utilized to achieve the review? _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

9. Does your state encourage the sharing of resources between the public and independent institutions through specialized programs?

Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please specify mechanism(s) _____

_____

10. What does your agency or association perceive as the major issue(s) involved in the area of state planning for postsecondary education involving independent higher education in the next several years? i.e. what are the major agenda items which must be addressed?

11. How successful do you feel the state's planning agency has been in effectively involving the independent sector in state planning and policy development?

Successful _____; Marginally Successful _____; Unsuccessful _____;
Not a concern _____.
Please comment on your response by citing positive and negative factors and influences:

12. How successful do you feel the state's planning agency has been in planning for the effective utilization of the independent sector resources in the best interest of the state?

Successful _____; Marginally Successful _____; Unsuccessful _____; Not a concern _____.
Please comment on your response by citing positive and negative factors and influences:

Thank you for your assistance and please return the questionnaire and any supporting documents in the attached self-addressed envelope.

Jay L. Chronister, Associate Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Ruffner Hall
University of Virginia
405 Emmet Street
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

APPENDIX D

AGENCIES RESPONDING TO STUDY SURVEY

INDEPENDENT COLLEGE ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

Alabama	- Council for the Advancement of Private Colleges in Alabama
Arkansas	- Arkansas Council of Independent Colleges and Universities
California	- Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Connecticut	- Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges
Delaware	- Delaware Association of Independent Colleges
D.C.	- Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area
Florida	- Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, Inc.
Illinois	- Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities
Indiana	- Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Inc.
Iowa	- Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities
Kansas	- Associated Independent Colleges of Kansas
Kentucky	- Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities
Maryland	- Maryland Independent Colleges and University Association
Massachusetts	- Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts
Michigan	- Independent Colleges and Universities of Michigan
Minnesota	- Minnesota Private College Council
Mississippi	- Mississippi Association of Private Colleges
Missouri	- Independent Colleges and Universities of Missouri
Nebraska	- Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Nebraska
New Jersey	- Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in New Jersey
New Mexico	- Council of Independent Colleges and Universities of New Mexico
New York	- Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities
North Carolina	- North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Ohio	- Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio
Oklahoma	- Oklahoma Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Oregon	- Oregon Independent Colleges Association
Pennsylvania	- Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities
South Carolina	- South Carolina Council, Inc.
Tennessee	- Tennessee Council of Private Colleges
Texas	- Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas
Virginia	- Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia
Washington	- Washington Friends of Higher Education
West Virginia	- West Virginia Foundation of Independent Colleges, Inc.
Wisconsin	- Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities

PUBLIC RESPONDENTS TO SURVEY

Alabama	- Commission on Higher Education
Alaska	- Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education
Arizona	- State Board of Regents
Arkansas	- Department of Higher Education
California	- California Postsecondary Education Commission
Colorado	- Commission on Higher Education
Connecticut	- Board of Higher Education
Delaware	- Delaware Postsecondary Education Commission
D.C.	- Commission on Postsecondary Education
Florida	- Florida Department of Education
Georgia	- Georgia Postsecondary Education Commission
Hawaii	- State Postsecondary Education Commission
Idaho	- State Board of Education
Illinois	- Board of Higher Education
Indiana	- Commission for Higher Education
Iowa	- Board of Regents
Kansas	- Board of Regents
Kentucky	- Council on Higher Education
Louisiana	- State Board of Regents
Maine	- Postsecondary Education Commission of Maine
Maryland	- Board for Higher Education
Massachusetts	- Postsecondary Education Commission
Michigan	- Department of Education
Minnesota	- Higher Education Coordinating Board
Missouri	- Department of Higher Education
Montana	- Board of Regents of Higher Education
Nebraska	- Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education
Nevada	- Nevada Higher Education Commission
New Hampshire	- New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission
New Jersey	- Department of Higher Education
New Mexico	- Board of Educational Finance
New York	- Office of Postsecondary Research, Information Systems, and Institutional Aid, State Education Department
North Carolina	- General Administration, University of North Carolina
North Dakota	- Postsecondary Education Commission, Board of Higher Education
Ohio	- Board of Regents
Oklahoma	- State Regents for Higher Education
Oregon	- Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission
Pennsylvania	- State Department of Education
Rhode Island	- Bureau of Postsecondary Education
South Carolina	- Commission on Higher Education
South Dakota	- Board of Regents

Tennessee	- Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Texas	- Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Utah	- State Board of Regents
Vermont	- Higher Education Planning Commission
Virginia	- State Council of Higher Education
Washington	- Council for Postsecondary Education
Wisconsin	- University of Wisconsin